

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed August 5, 2004. In order to advance prosecution of this case, Applicants amend Claims 1, 8, 16, 23 and 101, and cancel Claims 31-94 and 102-104 without prejudice or disclaimer. The amendments are not considered to be narrowing or necessary for patentability. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Confirmation of Election and Interview Summary

Pursuant to a telephone conversation between the Examiner and Ms. Keiko Ichiye on July 28, 2004, Applicants hereby confirm the election without traverse to prosecute Group I, Claims 1-30, 95-101 and 105, which are drawn to "multi-computer data transferring via shared memory, classified in class 709, subclass 213." Claims 31-94 and 102-104 are hereby withdrawn from the instant application without prejudice or disclaimer.

Section 102(e) Rejections

Claims 1-30, 95-101 and 105 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,330,605 B1 to Christensen et al. (hereinafter "*Christensen*"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for the reasons discussed below.

With respect to independent Claim 1, as amended, Applicants submit that *Christensen* does not disclose, teach or suggest at least "providing a cache community on a first side of a point of presence, the cache community comprising at least one peer, each peer having an associated first content portion indicating content obtained from a second side of the point of presence to be cached by the respective peer."

Christensen is directed toward a proxy cache cluster ("PCC") "applicable to a reverse proxy environment." (*Christensen*, col. 1, lines 49-50). *Christensen*'s PCC "front-ends the [web] servers of a service provider to increase the availability of services offered by the provider." (*Id.*, col. 5, lines 25-29). In essence, the web servers have "helpers" to help manage and cache various data that a user tries to access via the Internet. (See, e.g., FIGS. 1 and 2 of *Christensen*). Conversely, Applicants' cache community is applicable to what *Christensen* refers to as a "forward proxy" environment. This cache community is separate from the web servers that host the information and, in essence, exist on the "other side" of the Internet remote from the web servers. A user of a personal computer (e.g., a peer) does not have to access the web server via the Internet to become part of the cache community. Thus,

the cache community exists on one side of a point of presence, while the web server exists on the other side of the point of presence.

For at least this reason, *Christensen* does not anticipate amended Claim 1. Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully requested.

With respect to independent Claims 16 and 101, Applicants submit that independent Claims 16 and 101 are allowable for reasons analogous to those above in conjunction with amended Claim 1. Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully requested.

Dependent Claims 2-15 depend from independent Claim 1 and dependent Claims 17-30 depend from independent Claim 16, and are also not anticipated by *Christensen* because they include the limitations of their respective base claim, which are shown above to be allowable, as well as additional limitations that further distinguish *Christensen*. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 2-15 and 17-30 be withdrawn.

With respect to independent Claim 95, Applicants submit that *Christensen* does not disclose, teach or suggest at least “receiving a community list from the administration module in response to the community request, the community list including a list of communities.”

Christensen's PCC “comprises a group of processor/memory mechanisms (PMMs) that cooperately interact as a system . . . of proxy cache servers.” (*Christensen*, col. 3, lines 3-6). “The operational status of a PMM includes joining, up, down and leaving states.” (*Id.*, col. 8, lines 29-40). A PMM in *Christensen* simply does not receive a community list (*i.e.*, a PCC list) including a list of communities (*i.e.*, PCCs) from which to choose. There is only the ability in *Christensen* to join one PCC. For at least this reason, *Christensen* does not anticipate independent Claim 95. Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully requested.

With respect to independent Claims 98 and 105, Applicants submit that independent Claims 98 and 105 are allowable for reasons analogous to those above in conjunction with amended Claim 95. Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully requested.

Dependent Claims 96-97 depend from independent Claim 95 and dependent Claims 99-100 depend from independent Claim 98, and are also not anticipated by *Christensen* because they include the limitations of their respective base claim, which are shown above to be allowable, as well as additional limitations that further distinguish *Christensen*. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 96-97 and 99-100 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending Claims. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicants stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

No fees are believed to be due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants



Keiko Ichiye
Reg. No. 45,460

Correspondence Address:
Baker Botts L.L.P.
2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600
Dallas, Texas 75201

Date: November 5, 2004